#### **MMT** Objects

#### Florian Rabe

Jacobs University, Bremen, Germany

OpenMath 2014

#### Overview

- ► Major OPENMATH-based experiment/system
- MMT
  - Universal representation language for formal logical content

inspired by OPENMATH, OMDOC

 Implementation with generic support for logical and knowledge management functionality

e.g., module system, type reconstruction; presentation, editing

► Object layer uses OPENMATH as primary data structure

# Point of This Talk

- Describe differences between MMT objects and OPENMATH objects
- Provide additional information for further development of OPENMATH
- Not a
  - position paper
  - standard enhancement proposal

 $\rm Mmt's$  deviations may or may not be good for  $\rm OPENMATH$ 

#### Grammars

- c: reference to symbol/constant (OMS)
- x: reference to variable (OMV)

OpenMath

MMT

objects
$$E$$
 $::=$  $\mathcal{L}^c(s)$  $|$  $c \mid x$  $|$  $c(\gamma; \Gamma; E^*)$ contexts $\Gamma$  $::=$  $(x[: E][= E])^*$ substitutions $\gamma$  $::=$  $(x = E)^*$ 

## Literals

OpenMath

- ▶ 4 fixed literal types: integers, float, string, byte array
- concrete syntax fixed by standard
- side note: OPENMATH standard CDs define no operations on strings or byte arrays

MMT literals  $\mathcal{L}^{c}(s)$ 

- extensible set of literal types
  like extensible set of symbols
- no individual literal types built-in
- c is symbol whose documentation defines
  - syntax (string encoding)
  - semantics (valid values and their meaning)

of string s, which represents the literal value

#### Attributions

OpenMath

- attributed variables in particular needed for type attributions
- semantically attributed objects does anybody use this?
- ignorable attributions

 $M\ensuremath{\mathsf{MT}}$ : no attributions

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{ contexts declare variables } x[:E][=E] \\ & \text{ effectively 2 built-in attribution keys} \\ \mathcal{ATT}(x;[\texttt{type} \mapsto T],[\texttt{def} \mapsto D]) & \simeq & x[:T][=D] \end{array}$$

 ignorable attributions as extra-linguistic metadata somewhat similar to HTML + RDFa



OpenMath

Explicit error objects

 $M\ensuremath{\operatorname{MT}}$  : no errors

error objects recovered as special case of application objects

# **Complex Objects**

OpenMath

- 4 constructions: attribution of key-value list, error, application, binding
- Note:
  - attribution and binding are purely structural
  - error implies semantic properties
  - application is in between

is function application semantics implied or not?

Ммт

- single construction  $c(\gamma; \Gamma; \vec{E})$
- purely structural
  - $\blacktriangleright$  named children  $\gamma$
  - bound variables F
  - unnamed children (in scope of bound variables)
- each construction labeled with symbol c
- ▶ semantics of  $c(\gamma; \Gamma; \vec{E})$  defined solely by semantics of c

## Complex Objects (2)

OpenMath-Mmt correspondence  $O \simeq E$  If

$$O_i \simeq E_i$$
 and  $V_j \simeq X_j$ ,

then for applications:

$$\mathcal{A}(c, O_1, \ldots, O_n) \simeq c(\cdot; \cdot; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$$

bindings:

$$\mathcal{B}(c; V_1, \ldots, V_m; O_1) \simeq c(\cdot; X_1, \ldots, X_n; E_1)$$

errors:

$$\mathcal{E}(c; O_1, \ldots, O_n) \simeq c(\cdot; \cdot; E_1, \ldots, E_n)$$

# Complex Objects (3)

- What does  $\gamma$  do in  $c(\gamma; \Gamma; \vec{E})$ ?
- Generalization beyond application and binding objects
- Substitution  $\gamma$  used for
  - named arguments in function application
  - records
  - list of cases in pattern-match

## Conclusion

 $\blacktriangleright~{\rm Mmt}$  grammar uses only 4 productions

- constants
- variables
- literals
- complex objects
- OPENMATH uses 10 productions
  - 4 kinds of literals
  - 4 kinds of complex objects
- $\blacktriangleright\ \mathrm{Mmt}$  loses some expressivity, especially for applications
- $\blacktriangleright$  But gained simplification crucial in  $M{\rm M}{\rm T}$  implementation